



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,347	04/29/2004	John F. Poole	SYB/0108.00	3346
31779	7590	08/28/2007	EXAMINER	
JOHN A. SMART			SEYE, ABDOU K	
708 BLOSSOM HILL RD., #201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS GATOS, CA 95032-3503			2194	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/28/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/709,347	POOLE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Abdou Karim Seye	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on June 18, 2007 has been received and entered. The amendment amended Claims 1-3, 20-22. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-40. The Examiner notes that Claims 39 and 40 are not included into the new list of claims submitted by the applicant. The examiner considers this as a typographical error from the applicant and treats these two claims as they should have been part of the new list of claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

3. Claims 1-11, 13-31 and 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (20040199636).

Claims 1, 19-21 Brown teaches, in a database system, a method system and product for providing a stored procedure as a Web service, the method comprising:

predefining a stored procedure to be invoked upon receiving a client request for a particular Web service (paragraph 28);

receiving an incoming request from a particular client for the particular Web service at an HTTP server incorporated into the database system (abstract; FIG. 2; paragraph 26-30; the database system is the service provider 11 of FIG. 2);

in response to the incoming request, identifying the stored procedure that is predefined for the particular Web service (paragraph 28, 45 and 58);

executing the identified stored procedure for generating a result set; and returning the result set back to the particular client (Fig. 6; paragraph 30)

Claim 2, Brown teaches, wherein the incoming request is received by an HTTP server that is built into a database engine of the database system (abstract; FIG. 2: 25).

Claim 3, Brown further teaches, upon receiving the incoming request, verifying that the request comprises a valid HTTP request for a Web service (paragraph 43; security check).

Claim 4, Brown teaches, wherein client requests employ HTTP protocol.

Claim 5, Brown further teaches, wherein client requests further specify a selected one of XML, SOAP, WSDL, and raw format.

Claim 6, Brown teaches, wherein said returning step further comprises:

formatting the result set into a particular presentation format; and thereafter returning the formatted result set back to the particular client (paragraph 26, posting XML message to the web via HTTP server).

Claim 7, Brown teaches, wherein said executing step further comprises:

creating a temporary pseudo connection to a database engine of the database system; and executing the stored procedure through said temporary pseudo connection (paragraph 28).

Claim 8, Brown teaches, wherein the incoming request comprises a URL (paragraph 29).

Claim 9, Brown further teaches, wherein the URL includes parameter information affecting how the identified stored procedure is executed (paragraph 64-70).

Claim 10, Brown teaches, wherein the identified stored procedure may include any valid SQL statement (paragraph 69).

Claim 11, Brown teaches, wherein the identified stored procedure itself may invoke other stored procedures (paragraph 28).

Claim 13, Brown teaches, wherein the identified stored procedure selects data from a database, and wherein the result set returned to the particular client comprises that data formatted in a manner suitable for return via HTTP protocol (paragraph 28-29, 31 and 46).

Claim 14, Brown further teaches, wherein the data is formatted for return as XML-formatted data (paragraph 47).

Art Unit: 2194

Claim 15, Brown further teaches wherein the result set comprises a plurality of database rows, and wherein the XML-formatted data comprises said plurality of database rows delimited with XML row tags (paragraph 113).

Claim 16, Brown teaches, wherein the identified stored procedure itself may set HTTP header information that is returned to the particular client (paragraph 31).

Claim 17, Brown teaches, wherein the incoming request is received via a selected one of HTTP, FTP, and telnet protocol (paragraph 31).

Claim 18, Brown teaches, wherein the system first checks user authentication for the particular client before executing the identified stored procedure (paragraph 43).

As per claims 22-31 and 33-40, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (20040199636) in view of Crisan et al (US 20030191769).

Claims 12 and 32, Brown teaches, in a database system, a method, system and product for providing a stored procedure as a Web service as in claims 1, 19-21 above, but he does not explicitly teach, wherein execution of the identified stored procedure occurs asynchronously with respect to the incoming request. However, in the same field of endeavor, Crisan teaches in (paragraph140 and 144) asynchronous execution of a workflow function. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brown's invention with Crisan's invention to asynchronously manage flow of operations on a workflow. One would have been motivated to asynchronously execute stored procedures on workflow process in order to provide efficient execution of a business logic (Crisan; paragraph 58)

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on June 18, 2007 with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Estrada et al (US 7237002) discloses a system and method for dynamic browser management of web site.

Khalessi et al (US 6633900) discloses a mobile crew management system for distributing work order assignments to mobile field crew units..

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2194

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 7:30am - 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

AKS
August 20, 2007

WILLIAM THOMSON
ADVISORY PATENT EXAMINER